

# NOTES ON THE SYNTAX OF THE LATIN INSCRIPTIONS FOUND IN SPAIN

BY

HENRY MARTIN

*A Dissertation*

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY  
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

---

BALTIMORE  
J. H. FURST COMPANY

1909





# NOTES ON THE SYNTAX OF THE LATIN INSCRIPTIONS FOUND IN SPAIN

BY

HENRY MARTIN

*A Dissertation*

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY  
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



---

BALTIMORE  
J. H. FURST COMPANY

1909





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2026

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | PAGE. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| INTRODUCTION.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 5-6   |
| CONCORD.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 7-11  |
| Adjectives, 7; Pronouns, 8; Verbs—Singular for Plural, 9;<br>Plural for Singular, 9.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |       |
| THE CASES.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 12-27 |
| Nominative Case—Nominative in Titles, 12; Nominative of the<br>Name, 12; Genitive Case—Limiting Genitive, 13; Possessive<br>Genitive, 13; Partitive Genitive, 13; Genitive of Quality, 14;<br>Genitive with Adjectives, 15; Genitive with Verbs, 16;<br>Dative Case—Dative with Verbs, 16; Mihi nomen est, 18;<br>Accusative Case—Accusative with Verbs, 18; Ablative<br>Case—Ablative of Quality, 19; Modal Ablative, 19; Abla-<br>tive used Adverbially, 20; Ablative with Adjectives 20;<br>Ablative with Verbs, 21; Expressions of Time, 22; Local<br>Relations, 24; Ablative Absolute, 26. |       |
| INTERCHANGE OF CASES.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 27-30 |
| Nominative and Genitive, 27; Nominative and Accusative, 28;<br>Genitive and Vocative, 28; Genitive and Ablative, 29;<br>Accusative and Ablative, 29.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |       |
| PRONOUNS.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 30-31 |
| VERBS.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 32-40 |
| Tenses—Present for Future and Vice Versa, 32; Future Perfect,<br>32; Tenses of the Infinitive, 33; Moods—Infinitive, 33;<br>Indicative in Indirect Questions, 34; Subjunctive for the<br>Imperative, 34; Mood after Conjunctions, 35; Impersonal<br>Verbs, 35; Regimen of Verbs, 36; Compound Verbs, 38.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |       |
| PREPOSITIONS.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 40-46 |
| ADVERBS.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 46-48 |
| CONCLUSION.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 48-49 |



## INTRODUCTION.

---

The subject of Latin inscriptions found in Spain is not an untried field of research. In view of the rather complete work upon this material recently published by Carnoy,<sup>1</sup> a brief statement in regard to the purpose of this pamphlet will be relevant. It is not the object, at least the primary object, of this work to solve any of the great problems that have so long engaged the attention of students of language, such as those broached by Gröber, Sittl, Mohl and others. On the contrary, it is confessedly syntactical, undertaken with a view to seeing what contribution these inscriptions would make to Latin syntax as it is at present worked out, what details a study of them could add to the grammar of the language, and further what examples of rare usage could be added to those found in works on syntax in case the testimony of Spanish inscriptions should ever come to be embodied in such a treatise, and incidentally to observe what light, if any, could be thrown on the relation between the Latin of these documents and the Spanish language.

The difficulty of such a task owing to scarcity of material and want of accurate dating, and the delicacy and care in interpretation required by this matter have been comprehensively stated by Carnoy in the introduction to his treatise; they do not need reiteration here. Wherever possible, comparison with the results obtained by Pirson<sup>2</sup> for inscriptions of Gaul has been made and to facilitate such a comparison a selection of topics and a plan of arrangement essentially similar to his have been adopted; for this no apology is needed. As far as possible those points treated by Carnoy have been omitted, though this material was for the most part arranged when his articles ap-

<sup>1</sup> *Le latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions.* Bruxelles, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule.* Bruxelles, 1901.



peared. In a few cases for the sake of symmetry points already noted by him have been retained.

The material dealt with is substantially that given by Carnoy, with the exception that the inscriptions on amphorae, C. I. L., Vol. XV, were not used, and with the addition of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, No. 9, which appeared subsequent to the publication of Carnoy's articles in the *Muséon*. The works most frequently cited and followed are those on Syntax by Kühner, Draeger, Neue and Schmalz and the work of Bonnet on the Latin of Gregory of Tours. The following abbreviations may require explanation: G-L.=Latin Grammar, ed. Gildersleeve-Lodge, 1894; I. H. C.=Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae, ed. Hübner. The inscriptions cited from the 2d volume of the Corpus are indicated by numbers simply.



## CONCORD.

### I. ADJECTIVES.

An expression made up of a noun and some other word joined to it by the preposition *cum*, in classical Latin is commonly treated as singular. A few cases are found in these inscriptions where such a word group is regarded as singular judged by the number of the verb, but as plural when modified by an adjective. This construction is both natural and classical.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 259, *Sanxit cum coniuge . . . duobusque natis . . . caventes*. Parallel with this, however, appears a construction occurring not so frequently in Cicero, but found often and with extended application in writers of the Augustan Age, in which the modifier of a collective noun or its equivalent is written in the plural, even though the verb may stand in the singular.<sup>2</sup> 2071, *Ordo . . . dedicatissimi d. d.*; 3730, 6004, *Sodalitium vernarum Isidem colentes*; I. H. C. 244, *Qui in hac aula dei ingreditur . . . deponant ingredientes*.

Some of the examples of irregularity in agreement to be cited in other connections show violation of the rules of gender in addition to other peculiarities. At this point may be recorded a few examples in which the departure from this principle seems to be the primary feature. 3509, *Valeria . . . se vivo fecit*; 4248, *Statuam . . . positam exornandum . . . censuer(unt)*; 1580, *Conditus officio Graeca ser. hic. sita est*; 4512, *Propter insignia bene gesti proconsulatus omnes*; I. H. C. 22<sup>b</sup>, *Era siscens quattus*; I. H. C. 379<sup>b</sup>, *Cui . . . crustatam stringat tortilis ansa latus*.

In the majority of the cases just given noun and adjective

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 1878, 2, p. 34, par. 14. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 16, par. 9.2.

are separated by one or more words, yet neglect of concord may occur even where they are in immediate contact as the following will show: 2295, *Adsiduae mater*; 4310, *Incomparabili religionis eius*; I. H. C. 335, *Hae tumulo*; I. H. C. 215, *Pastor suique obibus . . . repellit mundi delicia*.

## II. PRONOUNS.

As one might expect, glaring inconsistencies in the agreement of the relative with its antecedent appear. Bonnet<sup>1</sup> has recorded similar constructions found in the Latin of Gregory of Tours and is probably correct in explaining one phase of it,<sup>2</sup> at least, as due to the similarity in sound between the different case forms of the relative in rapid pronunciation. In the examples cited below it will be seen that little difference is made between *quem* and *quam*, and even between *qui* and *quae*,<sup>3</sup> so that even in these few examples there seems to be definitely foreshadowed that leveling of the forms of the relative so characteristic of the Romance languages.<sup>4</sup> For a similar list made up from inscriptions of Gaul see Pirson.<sup>5</sup>—2211, *Tesseram offerimus . . . quem . . . iubemus suscipi*; 5393, *Memoria . . . quem fecit*; I. H. C. 258, *En quem cernis . . . Tarasia Christo dicata*; I. H. C. 403, *Saturina qui vixit*; I. H. C. 519, *Eulalia . . . qui passa est*.

In the case of personal pronouns practically no irregularity occurs. Worthy of mention, however, are two examples in which the pronoun fails to be adapted in number to the person referred to, but occurring as it does in a formula the error is a mere inadvertence. 1993, *Politice an. L, Crysidae an. V, Pusinnicae an V, h. s. s., s. t. t. l.*; also 5536, see p. 9.

<sup>1</sup> *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, p. 501.

<sup>2</sup> *l. c.*, p. 499.

<sup>3</sup> Carnoy, *l. c.*, p. 269.

<sup>4</sup> Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, 2, pp. 143-144.

<sup>5</sup> *l. c.*, pp. 158-159.



### III. VERBS.

#### 1. *Singular for Plural.*

(a) With compound subject.—In classical Latin two or more subjects in the singular connected by *et* or other co-ordinating conjunction might be followed by a verb in either singular or plural number according as they were regarded as acting independently or in concert.<sup>1</sup> In these inscriptions the construction is of frequent occurrence and with such a subject the singular is so uncommon that the few examples of it are worth recording. 5393, *Quem fecit pater et mater et Leucadius*; I. H. C. 230<sup>b</sup> (p. 120), *Rudesindus episcopus et Petrus abbas me iussit fieri*. In a certain number of inscriptions real irregularity is caused by the employment of formulas in an abbreviated form, so that the proper connection between them and the rest of the sentence was lost. In these cases, no doubt the graver applied the traditional and well-worn formulas without thinking to adapt them to the number of persons mentioned. 3344, *Q. Lucretius Silvinus . . . et Q. Lucretius Silvanus pi in suos h. s. e.*; 3658, *L. Fabius Proculus . . . Vitoria Omullina . . . h. s. e. s.*; 5536, *M. Sempronio M. l. principi, Semp(r)oniae L. l. Secundae, Luriae C. f. Faustillae . . . h. s. e. s. t. t. l.*

(b) With plural subject.—It is possible to explain most of the examples under this caption by saying that the subject, though plural, is regarded as a mass or entity and so is followed by the singular, or else separated from the verb by a phrase and in this way the thought is not accurately maintained. 5439<sup>1.5.11</sup>, *Quicumque pontif(ices) quique augures . . . lectus co-optatusve erit*; 6278<sup>47</sup>, *Ut ea pretia . . . pertineat*; I. H. C. 396, *Datum est . . . in auro soledos III.*

#### 2. *Plural for Singular.*

In Spanish inscriptions the examples of two nouns connected by *-ve* both occur in one inscription and both are followed by

<sup>1</sup> G-L., *Latin Grammar*, par. 285, Rem. 1; Kühner, l. c., 2, par. 14. 1; Pirson, l. c., p. 161.

plural verb.<sup>1</sup> 5439 <sup>2.1.28</sup>, Eamque pecuniam II vir prae-f(ectusve) dandam . . . curanto; 5439 <sup>2.2.10</sup>, Itque . . . Il vir aedil(is)ve dimoliendum curanto. Examples of irregularity, however, are seen and each is capable of individual explanation. 6278 <sup>42</sup>, Procurator qui provinciis praesidebunt; probably brought down by mistake from *his qui . . . praesidebunt* v. 41; 6278 <sup>37</sup>, Lanistas . . . negem sibi copiam . . . praebendas esse; where the plural may be taken from *lanistas*; I. H. C. 157, Arcadius vixit annos VII et requieverunt in pace . . . et fuerunt servi . . . Vincenti, etc., where the plural idea seems to be suddenly adopted. One of the most interesting examples here is the following: 3570, M. Sempronius Hymnus suo et M. Semproni Reburri fili sui nomine . . . restituerunt. The sentence is logically correct, since the author had two persons in mind. In reality a noun combined with a prepositional phrase, a modifier of the verb, is regarded as plural. Similar to this is a case in which the structure of the sentence was changed after the verb was reached, or else the subject was completely lost. I. H. C. 390, Hic requiescit . . . cui decies . . . (per) metas regendi monacos incubuere.

It has already been mentioned (p. 7) that a subject in the singular modified by a *cum* phrase might take a plural verb, but as a matter of fact is seldom treated as plural in the best writers.<sup>2</sup> For the entire body of Gallic inscriptions, even, Pirson<sup>3</sup> has recorded but a single example of the plural with such a subject. In Spanish inscriptions, too, this type of subject is for the most part treated as singular. The following cases of plural may be noted: 3298, Fausta cum filio . . . hic sit. sunt; I. H. C. 334, Ut domus haec cum habitatoribus . . . florescant. To these may be added one other example, in which this combination is qualified by a word in the plural in apposition with the phrase and the plural verb is in consequence

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, par. 14. 1.

<sup>2</sup> G-L., l. c., par. 285. 3, Rem. 2; Draeger, Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache, 1, p. 178, par. 105.

<sup>3</sup> l. c., p. 163.



natural and normal.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 465, Offerunt famuli dei Adelfonsus . . . cum coniuge. Especially was the singular in vogue when such a compound subject represented a difference of persons.<sup>2</sup> The one example in Spanish inscriptions is at variance with this. I. H. C. 283, Ego Sanceius . . . cum uxore mea . . . iussimus.

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 34. 2 (end).

<sup>2</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 34, par. 14. 2.

## THE CASES.

## NOMINATIVE CASE.

*Nominative in Titles:*—The Nominative is used in inscriptions of various kinds that imply action or character.<sup>1</sup> This is in reality the Nominative of the title. The only apparent exceptions to this principle occur when *monumentum*, *dis manibus*, or some other word or phrase thoroughly familiar is for the sake of brevity omitted. In this event the title is to all appearances in the Genitive or Dative case. This is common in inscriptions everywhere and no examples need be cited. The titles in a single inscription, however, in which Nominative and Genitive seem to be used side by side deserve notice. They are given without comment, since Hübner's note on the inscription seems complete. The titles are as follows: 5181, I. Centesimae argentariae stipulationes. II. Scripturae praeconii. III. Balinei fruendi. IV. Sutrinii. V. Tonstrini. VI. Tabernarum fulonarum. VII. Scripturae scaurariorum et testariorum. VIII. Ludi magistri. IX. Usurpationes puteorum sive pittaciarium.

*Nominative of the Name:*—It was in the poets of late Latin that instead of an oblique case we find the Nominative as the case which simply names a person or thing, as in the example "Lazarus hic habuit nomen" cited by Schmalz.<sup>2</sup> Probably the number of instances of this type for the entire literature is far from large. In view of this, therefore, the one example found in these inscriptions is amply worth mentioning and recording. I. H. C. 12, Venantia nomen . . . gesi.

<sup>1</sup> Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek*, par. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Lateinische Syntax*, Müller's *Handbuch der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, II, 1900, p. 227, par. 43; see also Draeger, l. c., I, 390, par. 172.

# GENITIVE CASE.

*Limiting Genitive:*—The sphere of the Genitive in its simplest form is considerably widened in the language of inscriptions, so much so that it often appears to indicate ignorance on the part of the writer of the idiomatic Latin turn or to be his method of expressing an idea in the fewest possible words without reference to clearness. The result may be a heaping of Genitives and a good example is the following: 5260, Valeria Avita aram tauriboli sui natalici redditu d. d., where Hübner explains thus: ara posita propter taurobolium deae redditum die natali Avitae. Under this head, too, may be placed a strange use of the Genitive with the words *tempus* and *vetustas* in which the latter in the Genitive is employed as a descriptive term of the former, which then virtually becomes redundant. 4756, Vias et pontes tempore vetustatis conlapsos; so also 4826, 4853. But 4788, Temporis vetustate conlapsos.

*Possessive Genitive:*—The Genitive is found in classical Latin after the preposition *ad*, rarely after others, the word *templum* being omitted.<sup>1</sup> The only examples approaching this in Spanish inscriptions are extremely uncertain, but if correct mark an advance over the above principle. 2146, Si quis titulum ad mei nominis astiterit. Here Hübner thinks *memoriam* is the omission, Mommsen regards the preposition as simply post-positive. I. H. C. 472, Episcopus de Sce Marie feci.

*Partitive Genitive:*—There may be noted here the Genitive dependent upon neuter adjectives in the singular or plural employed as nouns, a construction sparingly used by classical writers, but extended by Livy and later authors.<sup>2</sup> Not many examples occur and these few are found in late Christian inscriptions. I. H. C. 385, Ut numquam sentiat seba Gehennae; I. H. C. 218<sup>b</sup>, Per devia mundi; I. H. C. 218<sup>a</sup>, Qui temnens fluida conscendit lucida caeli; I. H. C. 385, Intima qui penetras

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 175. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 453. 4; Schmalz, l. c., p. 237. 62.



cunctorum. Such expressions as *saevissimus saevorum* are not real Latin, but are found in those authors who are most influenced by the Greek. The type selected is not altogether fortunate, since its parallelism with the following is not exact. However, somewhat like this are a number of phrases in these inscriptions with the difference that they are made up of nouns rather than of adjectives. They appear only in Christian inscriptions, where the influence of the Vulgate is manifest and are without doubt Hebraisms in origin. There may be, however, an element of the popular in them.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 49, 483, *Saecula saeculorum*; I. H. C. 218, *Presta deus deorum*.

*Genitive of Quality*:—While used at all periods of the language to express quality, the Genitive was in especial favor in popular speech, where it seems to have been used somewhat to the exclusion of the Ablative.<sup>2</sup> Bonnet<sup>3</sup> and Pirson<sup>4</sup> have reached this conclusion in regard to the Latin of Gregory of Tours and of Gallic inscriptions respectively. The fact is noticeable in Spanish inscriptions, also, where it is used to such an extent that the Ablative may be said to be of comparatively rare occurrence. The following list, while by no means complete, is intended to convey some idea of the extent and sphere of the Genitive of Quality, with which may be compared a briefer list given under the Ablative of Quality, p. 19: 131, *Deo Endovellico praesentissimi ac praestantissimi numinis*; 4061, *Theopompo . . . aedilici iuris*; 4146, *Uxori rarissimi exempli*; 2436, *Feminae incomparabilis pietatis*; 4315, *Factionis Venetae Fusco sacravimus aram*; 1699, *Alumna priscae pietatis*; I. H. C. 362, *Obiit felicis memoriae Leander*. We may further consider as Genitive of Quality a number of constructions with the Genitive which are used with some frequency and which may be grouped as follows:

1. Tribal origin, domicile, etc. 1678, *Iuliae G. f. . . . domus Augustae*; 365, *Valerius Avit. . . . de vico Baedoro*

<sup>1</sup>Schmalz, l. c., 237. 62, Rem. 3; cf. Petron. 37, *Habet nummorum nummos*; 43, *Olim oliorum* (Friedländer's note).

<sup>2</sup>Schmalz, l. c., p. 236, par. 61.

<sup>3</sup>l. c., p. 548.

<sup>4</sup>l. c., p. 175.

gentis Pinton; 829, L. Domitius T. f. Gal. Vetto Otobesani; I. H. C. 249, Concessum est sancto Salvatori Ovetensis sedis. This is especially frequent in one large class of names mostly foreign in origin and with Genitive plural in *-um* such as: 2708, Cassio Corovescum; 3082, Aplondus Dagencium M. f.<sup>1</sup>

2. Campaigns one has served, number of years one has lived, or time in general. 1126, D. M. S. L. Valeri nepotis militis stipendiorum VII annorum XXX; 4383, M. Iuvento incremento . . . mensium IX; 3564, G. Lol(i)us Rufus annorum XXXIV. Probably the only certain example of the Ablative in expressions of the kind is: 3471, Herennia mortua est aetate XV an. As in Gallic inscriptions, so in those of Spain, the Genitive could be employed with the verbs *obire*, *recedere* and the like, and finally even with the verb *vivere*. In the case of all of these the Genitive is of rather unusual occurrence.<sup>2</sup> 3566, Qui obit(us est) annorum XIV; 3297, Marito . . . qui vixit annorum XXXX; I. H. C. 136, Recesset Tale . . . annorum XLII; I. H. C. 171, Occurrit Amator etatis sue XLIII.

It is plain that the use of the Genitive discussed in both the above captions marks an extension beyond classical bounds and, as Pirson<sup>3</sup> suggests, it may have been influenced by the classical Genitive of Quality. One would be safe in assuming further that the beginnings of the Genitive discussed in the latter were already laid in Latin of the Augustan Age, for in Varro<sup>4</sup> then in Livy and others is found *maiores triginta annorum*, to which Schmalz<sup>5</sup> traces the expressions *natus decem annorum*, *cum esset annorum decem*, *vixit annorum quattuor* of Sulpicius Severus.

*Genitive with Adjectives*:—In addition to its use with certain adjectives that regularly require the Genitive in classical Latin is found its use with several others in such a way as not to meet the requirements of standard prose.

*Doctus*.—4313, Tib. Cl. Apollinaris . . . artis medicine doctiss(imus).

<sup>1</sup> Hübner, Monumenta Linguae Ibericae, p. cxxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> l. c., p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> De Re Rustica, 2. 7. 1.

<sup>5</sup> l. c., p. 236. 61, Rem. 4.

*Fidelis*.—Here is usually found the Dative or an equivalent construction. In the example below, *fidelis* evidently has the force of a noun and the Genitive is therefore used. I. H. C. 117, Maria fidelis Chr(ist)i in vita sua.

*Studiosus*.—A word not appearing in the lexicons. It probably follows the construction of adjectives of desire and in this case *studiosus* would naturally be thought of and the Genitive would not be abnormal.<sup>1</sup> 6109 (Nec) ip(s)i stud(i)us artis.

*Unctus*.—The normal construction after this participle is the Ablative. cf. I. H. C. 463, Unctus crismate. But a strange use of the Genitive with this word is seen in a single inscription of very late date. One would think of a change of declension, but there is nothing to render this certain.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 464, Crismatis uncta.

*Genitive with Verbs*.—The Genitive with verbs may be dismissed with brief mention. The classical construction with *liberare* is Accusative of the person and Ablative of the thing. Livy, however, seems to be the first to employ with it a Genitive of the thing as in the phrase *voti liberare*; so also *culpae liberare*.<sup>3</sup> As cited in the example below, the Genitive is probably dependent upon the preceding noun rather than upon the verb following, but even in that case it seems worthy of recording as unusual. 1957, L. Porcio . . . qui . . . d(edit) ut aes alien(um) rei p(ublicae) . . . lib(eraret).

#### DATIVE CASE.

*Dative with Verbs*.—The most interesting cases of the Dative observed in these inscriptions are connected with its construction with verbs and hence they may be mentioned first.

*Dimittere*.—Noteworthy is the Dative with *dimittere*, as seen in I. H. C. 285, 286, 523, Dimittat ei deus. Here the complete expression may have been *dimittat ei peccata* somewhat as in I. H. C. 31, Quinigia in hoc loco quiescentis omnia peccata

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 319 (a).

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet, l. c., p. 364, n. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Livy 5. 28. 2; Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 487; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 338. 7.



dimitte. In the examples just given *dimittere* appears to have both the meaning and construction of a verb of pardoning.

*Precari*.—A verb which in the literature is transitive may by a slight difference in the shade of meaning become intransitive and as such take the Dative. Such a verb is *precari*, which in one inscription seems to have taken on the meaning of “call out to,” “pray to” and in this sense may legitimately take the Dative. 5186, Si sensus er(it) meae quietis qu(a)e lasso tibi dulcius precabor.

*Sociare*.—The Dative with *sociare* occurs first in Vergil.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 158, Ce(ti)bus s(an)c(t)orum merito sociatus resurgam.

*Dative with Verbs of fighting*.—With such verbs as *certare*, *pugnare*, etc., the Dative is poetical and on this ground is justified in one inscription.<sup>2</sup> 4315, Laudem cursus mernisti; certasti multis.

*Dative with Verbs of joining and the like*.—In the case of a certain class of verbs, chiefly of joining, and the like, either simple or compounded with *cum*, the best classical usage was *cum* and the Ablative. More rarely the Dative was used. With the past participle of these verbs the condition is described by Draeger<sup>3</sup> as one of wavering. In Spanish inscriptions they appear almost exclusively with the Dative, showing that they had moved away from the classical idiom and had allied themselves with later usage.<sup>4</sup> 1399, Omnis ut aetas sanguine me iunctam crederet esse sibi; I. H. C. 34<sup>a</sup>, Quod matris tumulo iungeris; I. H. C. 218<sup>b</sup>, Amore quo tibi coniunctus mansit . . . carus; I. H. C. 255, His pariter co(n)iunctae sunt; I. H. C. 213, Atletis iungitur rite celestibus; I. H. C. 455, Ethereis iungatur sorte beata locatus. To these may be added two others with the Dative, *connumerare*, which is not classical, and *coaequare*, which is seldom used in that period. I. H. C. 409, Connumerandus sanctis ministrabit antistes; I. H. C.

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, I. c., 1, p. 426.

<sup>2</sup> Hor., Odes 1. 3. 13; Draeger, I. c., 1, p. 406, par. 184.

<sup>3</sup> I. c., 1, p. 425.

<sup>4</sup> Bonnet, I. c., pp. 541 ff.

390, Qui cursum . . . peregit . . . Pauli Antonique meritis quoaequandus in aethera.

*Dative with Verbs of taking away:*—The Dative not only occurs with such verbs as *eripere*, but its use is further extended to several verbs not ordinarily so construed in classical Latin. It is perfectly regular in the following: 3475, Parentibus eripuit fortuna . . . me; Eph. Ep. 8. 194, Casus me eripuit matri e manibus; I. H. C. 247, Quisquis auferre presumpserit michi. But not so with *subducere*, *privare* and possibly *deducere* as in those below: 1425, Huic dono . . . heres XX non deduxit; 1293, Subductum primae Pyladem haec ara inventae indicat; I. H. C. 165, Quem sibi non sobu . . . privabit trans(itus is)te.

*Mihi nomen est:*—The well-known Latin idiom *mihi nomen est* has to a large extent disappeared to be replaced by less complex forms. For the most part periphrases are resorted to, especially in the metrical epitaphs, or else a direct turn like English “my name is, etc.,” is employed. 1235, Nome fuit nomen; 3501, Huius nomen Salviol(ae) fuerat; 1235, Haesit nascenti Cusuccia; I. H. C. 12, Nomen Venantia in saeculo gesi.

#### ACCUSATIVE CASE.

The constructions with the Accusative case were less complicated than those with the other oblique cases, were easier for the masses to use and one would expect them, therefore, to be less subject to radical departure from best usage. Such is the case in these inscriptions, where conservatism in the use of the Accusative is displayed and little out of the ordinary can be recorded in its treatment. The employment of a direct object with certain intransitive verbs, a phenomenon familiar in late Latin, occurs to some extent, thereby confirming the popular origin of these inscriptions. To those given below add others cited by Carnoy.<sup>1</sup>

*Blandiri.*—I. H. C. 214, Blandensque corda pleviu(m).

*Carere.*—4427, Dulcem carui lucem.

<sup>1</sup> I. c., p. 271; Bonnet, l. c., p. 533; Pirson, l. c., p. 170.

*Contingere*.—This growing disposition to convert intransitive into transitive verbs is further exemplified by the verb *contingere*. Not at all in classical Latin and rarely at a later period does this verb take an Accusative as used below. 4514, Quos honor . . . contigerit.

*Manere*.—Although it has the intransitive meaning of “remain,” yet it takes the Accusative in one inscription and appears to be construed like *manere* in the phrases *mors manet*, *exitus manet*. 1399, Cum me mea vita maneret.

#### ABLATIVE CASE.

*Ablative of Quality*:—It has been observed under the head of the Genitive that this case tends to be used to the exclusion of the Ablative where the quality of a thing is to be expressed. It remains only to cite a few other examples, of which there are not many, and to say that a large proportion of these, if all were collected, would be found to appear in the Christian epitaphs, which are often mechanical and imitatory in character. 172, Qui . . . hostili animo fuerint; 6087, M. Aurel. M. f. Emona patria; I. H. C. 149, Fafila . . . fide probata; I. H. C. 455, Ore modestus . . . mente quieta.

*Modal Ablative*:—The one example to be considered here is an interesting case of extension due to analogy. The familiar classical construction with the adjective *invitus* was the Ablative Absolute, *se* or *eo invito*. It is never found with the Genitive of a pronoun, as *invito eius* below. Forcellini<sup>1</sup> cites one example of it with the Genitive of a noun,<sup>2</sup> but this is by no means a parallel. The case we are dealing with is simply an extended use of *invitus* by analogy to the phrases *iussu eius*, *monitu eius*, *hortatu eius* and others.<sup>3</sup> 5439<sup>3.3.32</sup>, Dum ne invito eius opera exigatur qui . . . erit.

<sup>1</sup> Totius Latinitatis Lexicon.

<sup>2</sup> Ulpian, Dig. 16. 3. 11, Credit dominum non invitum fore huius solutionis.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 538.



*Ablative used adverbially*.—After the verbs *habere*, *putare* and others, active and passive, instead of a predicate Accusative, a construction with the prepositions *in* and *pro* with such words as *locus*, *numerus*, etc., followed by a Genitive could be used in the literature.<sup>1</sup> Further the Ablative of *numerus* was frequently employed as a sort of Ablative of Specification after numerals just as *pondo* with weights. Something like what appears to be a cross between these two usages occurs here, where *numero* appears not with a numeral, but with the adjective *alius* and would seem to be a free use of the word in this connection developed out of its use with numerals. It is, therefore, virtually equivalent to an adverb.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 140, *Hic sunt reliquiae numero sanctorum*; I. H. C. 140, *Et aliorum numero sanctorum*.

*Ablative with Adjectives*.—The Ablative with the following adjectives exhibits peculiarities worthy of note:

*Compos*.—In good Latin the Ablative with *compos* is rarely found.<sup>3</sup> 5965, *Voto sum compos*.

*Expers*.—Its use with the Ablative is confined chiefly to old Latin.<sup>4</sup> 172, *Me . . . expertem patria incolumitate fortunisque omnibus faxint*.

*Plenus*.—As in classical Latin, *plenus* is seen both with Genitive and Ablative with no seeming difference. 761, *Templum . . . superis et Caesare plenum*; 3633, *Morumque bonorum pleno*; I. H. C. 362, *Fide plenos*; I. H. C. 219, *Plenisque dierum*. This result was to be expected with an adjective like *plenus*; the real reason, then, for recording this at all is its possible construction in one example where it appears to take both Genitive and Ablative and that in the same phrase. Mommsen (cf. his note on the inscription) thinks some such word as *insignis* upon which the Ablative depended has not been preserved in the reading. Hübner, however, claims that the stone

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 385 (d).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Indices I. H. C., p. 155, col. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 284. 7; Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 476 (b).

<sup>4</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 325, Rem. 6; Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 560 (f); Holtze, *Syntaxis priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*, 1, p. 121.

has been preserved intact and that the reading as we have it is correct. 3738, Pietate, iustitia, fortitudine et pleno omnium virtutum.

*Purus*.—Cited with the Ablative without the preposition only from Horace.<sup>1</sup> An example can be added from these inscriptions. I. H. C. 456, Nobilis mundoque purus.

*Ablative with Verbs*.—Certain verbs also in Spanish inscriptions are followed by constructions with the Ablative not altogether normal and may be conveniently grouped here.

*Conglutinare*.—After this verb a construction with *cum* and the Ablative is the normal one. We may cite one example of the simple Ablative from Spanish inscriptions. I. H. C. 239, Conglutinans se norma monastica.

*Esse*.—A strange use of the Ablative is its apparent construction with *esse*, as if it were a verb of action, and hence the usage must be construed as a kind of Ablative of Means or Cause. Eph. Ep. 9. 176, Hoc fuit providentia actoris ut . . . mitteres illam.

*Perire*.—After *perire* in classical Latin might be used a noun in the Ablative denoting the cause or circumstances of the action. For example, the Ciceronian phrase *fame perire*. In Christian inscriptions this verb is followed by a noun *morte*, of cognate meaning, which at first sight appears redundant and analogous to the phrase cited above, but on closer examination reveals the influence of the Vulgate and seems to convey the paradoxical idea "he did not perish in death." I. H. C. 218, Nec morte periit sed vibit sede perhenni.

*Uti*.—In a Christian epitaph of late period, *utor* is followed by the relative adverb *unde*, which is, therefore, equivalent to a construction with the preposition *de*. One or more similar examples may be cited from early Latin.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 255, De pane . . . unde in cena usus est.

*Vendere*.—Here too may be mentioned a remarkable con-

<sup>1</sup> Sat. 2. 3. 213; Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 560.

<sup>2</sup> Ter., Adel. 981, cf. Parry's note (5. 9. 24.). Hinc dederis . . . unde utatur.

struction with the verb *vendere*. In standard prose this and kindred verbs took only *pluris* and *minoris*, Genitive of indefinite price. Indeed with regard to *plus* no Dative nor Ablative singular is ordinarily given by grammarians. The examples cited in works of syntax show few or no cases of the Ablative of *plus* with a verb of buying or selling.<sup>1</sup> Several well-defined cases of *plure* marking price occur, all in one inscription of between the years 176-180 A. D. It is probably an extension by analogy to the words *magno*, *plurimo*, *parvo* and the like regarded as neuter substantives, so that finally in popular Latin the expressions *caro*, *vili emere* could be used.<sup>2</sup> 6278<sup>61</sup>, Neque singulatum aliquem rei gladiatoriae causa vendat plure, etc.; occurs again l. 58.

#### EXPRESSIONS OF TIME.

By reason of great latitude of use, expressions of time merit distinctive treatment. In Spanish inscriptions expressions denoting time alternate in the Genitive, Accusative and Ablative cases. As has already been shown, the Genitive in this relation appears to be in origin, at least, the Genitive of Quality, but finally comes to express duration of time with verbs side by side with the Accusative and Ablative. The fact that the Ablative is often used parallel with the Accusative and even tends to supplant it in giving the age of persons, is a phenomenon common to all inscriptions and need not be dwelt upon here. It ought to be said, however, that this statement applies principally to pagan inscriptions. In Christian inscriptions the Accusative tends to reassert itself to such an extent that the following almost complete list with the Ablative may be made out for them: I. H. C. 71, 72, 73, Vixit annis; I. H. C. 158, Annis sexa(ginta p)eregi; I. H. C. 330, 342, 367, Vixit annis XIX. To these must be added a few that are placed

<sup>1</sup> G.-L., l. c., par. 90; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 335, par. 5; Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 464, par. 201, and p. 567, par. 247. But cf. Neue, Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, 2, par. 71.

<sup>2</sup> Schmalz, l. c., p. 249, par. 87; but cf. Carnoy, l. c., p. 47.



below. It is not at all rare to find the Accusative and the Ablative standing side by side in the same expression of time, thus confirming their practical identity to express duration of time.<sup>1</sup> 5443, Vixit annis XXXV, mens. V, dies XXVIII; 5144, Vixit annis LII, mens I, dies V; I. H. C. 139, In annibus viginti duos; I. H. C. 215, Quattuor denis et duo annos; I. H. C. 275, Duo et tribus mesibus.

In giving dates the classical construction *a. d. kal. Ian.* or *pridie nonas Ian.* appears as follows:

1. *Ante diem* is entirely omitted while the adjective form *kalendas*, etc., is still retained in the Accusative case, a method common enough in classical Latin and is here given simply for completeness. I. H. C. 3, Requievit in pace . . . XI kal. Novembres.

2. The forms *die*, *sub die*, take the place of *a. d.*, etc., and what follows is still put in the Accusative case. This is very frequently used. In rare instances the Genitive is found.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 46, Recepta in pace die IV idus Ianuarias; I. H. C. 362, Die II idus Martias die II nonas Apriles; I. H. C. 396, Sub die sexto id(us) Novembri(s). Prepositions are but sparingly used. I. H. C. 147, Iustus . . . in aera, etc.; so I. H. C. 252, 253, 254; I. H. C. 220, Septem de kalendis . . . Aprilis; I. H. C. 267, In ns Fbrii; I. H. C. 95, In novissimo die; I. H. C. 472, In S(a)n(c)ti Micaeli(s) die.

Here may be called attention to peculiarities noted in a few individual inscriptions. In the expression I. H. C. 143, Anno sexcentum decies era nonagesima novem, *sexcentum decies* seems to be a bold substitution for *sexies centum*. *Die* and *pridie* are found side by side in one inscription and the whole expression seems to be the simple equivalent of *a. d.* I. H. C. 316, Requievit in pace . . . die pridie kal. Februarias. The omission of any word to indicate time leaving an attribute with which it is to be supplied is noteworthy in one example. 59, Vivas pluribus (i. e. annis). Here, too, may be noted the

<sup>1</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 183; Carnoy, l. c., p. 268.

<sup>2</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 271.

turn for expressing the age of a person, which is rather unusual for Latin; only one example is found in these inscriptions: 2892, Cui . . . an(nos) haben(ti) XXV. This is interesting because of the similarity of the Romance idiom: French, j'ai . . . ans; Spanish, tengo . . . años. We may add to this several examples in Gallic inscriptions and one in Petronius.<sup>1</sup>

#### LOCAL RELATIONS.

Here again separate consideration is desirable. Place where is expressed both with and without the preposition *in*. In pagan inscriptions the tendency is to adhere to the classical construction and insert the preposition. Sufficient examples without *in*, however, occur to show that the practice of omitting it was well established among the people. In most cases, on the other hand, the noun is qualified by an attribute and the irregularity, if it may be so called, is thereby diminished.<sup>2</sup> 4314, Hoc . . . requiescunt ossa sepulchro; 2335, Iuvenis tumulo qualis iacet; 3180, Qui militavit cohorte X; 3453, Nunc iacis hoc tumulo. On the other hand the tendency to obliterate distinctions is shown by the use of the preposition with *locus*, which is contrary to the spirit of classical Latin.<sup>3</sup> The preposition is used also when *locus* is qualified by an adjective. 1062, I(n) loco quem, etc.; 1064, 1066, In locum quem, etc.; 3354, Iacet . . . in locum Campaniensem; 3015, Con(e)uiescen(t)es in locum. The preposition is omitted with the phrase *suo solo*, which is, therefore, treated as the classical *locus*.<sup>4</sup> 1956, Porticus ad balineum . . . solo suo . . . d. d.; 1074, Porticus lapideas . . . solo suo . . . d.; 1459, Q. Memmius . . . statuas duas . . . solo suo fecit. The same impossibility to generalize is met with in Christian inscriptions, nor is it possible to draw any definite line of distinction. The preference seems to tend toward the omission of the preposition, but too many cases of

<sup>1</sup> C. I. L. XII, 2141, 5276, Habere annos; Petron. 25, Puella quae non plus quam septem annos habere videbatur.

<sup>2</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> G.-L., l. c., p. 247, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., l. p. 525.

its use even with *locus* occur to make this statement strictly accurate. I. H. C. 31, In hoc loco quiescentis; I. H. C. 483, In locu(m) hunc s(anct)um; I. H. C. 115. (I)n locum Nativola; I. H. C. 376, In fundum; I. H. C. 174, In os tumulos; I. H. C. 33, In hoc saeculo . . . transegit; I. H. C. 57, In hoc altario; I. H. C. 60, In hoc tumulo iacet; I. H. C. 189, In isto loco sepultus est; I. H. C. 86, Celesti regnat in aula. But: I. H. C. 533, Sepulta est tumulo; I. H. C. 12, Hoc loco . . . elegi quiescere proles.

In more than one case the preposition is used with the proper name of a city, for the most part a late Latin usage, but perhaps always more or less common in popular speech.<sup>1</sup> 4587, In Helviano . . . pos(i)tae sunt; I. H. C. 488, Regnante . . . in Legione. In late Christian inscriptions the preposition *ab* may be used with the proper name of a city when motion from it is expressed, also a vulgar Latin turn.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 275, Venit a Corduva. The preposition *a* or *ab* is usually inserted, as it is in classical Latin, with the name of a city, when it is the point from which distance is measured. The violation of this principle, however, is found in several cases, and in most of them the name of the city begins with the vowel *a*, so that the omission might be a graver's error. 4697, Abiano ad oceanum; 4779, Aquis Flavis m. p., etc.; so 4780, 4781, 4782, 4783; 4872, 4870, Bracar Aug(usta) m. p. XIX; cf. 4803, a Bracar Aug(usta); so 4804, 4805, 4806. Verbs indicating motion to a place are for the most part followed by the Accusative with the preposition *ad* in regular fashion. Occasionally such a verb is construed with *in* and the Ablative, so that rest in a place is really the idea conveyed, though motion to a place is meant; even the Dative is found.<sup>3</sup> It will be noted that these examples are found in very late inscriptions, in which the difference between the cases is reduced to a minimum.<sup>4</sup> I. H. C. 244, Qui in hac aula . . . ingreditur; cf. 3871, Ingressum militiam.

<sup>1</sup> Schmalz, l. c., p. 255, par. 94 (end).

<sup>2</sup> G.-L., l. c., par. 391, Rem. 1; Schmalz, l. c., p. 254, par. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 270.

<sup>4</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 200.

It remains to notice a few substitutions. Pirson<sup>1</sup> has shown that the adjective *urbicus*, in Gallic inscriptions has come to be the equivalent of *Romanus*. In Spanish inscriptions the word is used more freely still and is substituted for the prepositional phrase *ad urbem Romanam* or simply *Romanam*. The reading seems certain enough to justify this interpretation. 379, M. Iul(io) Serano in itinere ur(bico) defuncto et sepulto. In still another case the Accusative of the name of a city is used instead of the Locative, or *apud* with the Accusative. 4227, Decuriali allecto Italicam.

#### ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE.

This construction, always a favorite in Latin, is very frequently used in Spanish inscriptions. In classical Latin, although it might express a variety of ideas, it was hedged about by definite restrictions and this very fact would expose it to variations and incorrectness of usage in the mouths of the ignorant. In the Latin of Gregory of Tours, for example, the Nominative, Accusative and Ablative are all used in this construction with practical identity of meaning.<sup>2</sup> In these inscriptions abundant signs of the disintegration of the Ablative Absolute appear. Of these one of the most noticeable is its replacement by the Nominative Absolute in late inscriptions. I. H. C. 275, *Peracta sunt . . . Ordinius peragens sceptrum*; I. H. C. 469, *Peracta sunt . . . Garsea sceptrum . . . peragens*. The best examples are those in which the Nominative and Ablative are used in the same sentence, thus furnishing additional evidence, were it needed, that the two constructions were parallel at this late period.<sup>3</sup> I. H. C. 472, *Re(ge) Adefonso Suero Alvarie abas*; 3240, *Factis pontibus et fistulis et lacus*. A good example of the misconception of the Ablative Absolute and its consequent weakening, and at the same time one that goes back farthest is the expression *se vivo*, *a, is*, and the

<sup>1</sup> l. c., p. 267.

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet, l. c., pp. 558 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 267.



like, which seems to be common to all inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> In a few phrases and only a few is it correctly used. 3459, *Viva sibi fecit*. It is possible that such examples contain the point of departure. The next step may then have been something like this: 4050, *Se vivi fecerunt*, the strict meaning of *se* having faded out. Finally the still more impossible Ablative Absolute makes its appearance. 2973, *Atilia . . . se viva fecit*; 3049, *Pompeia . . . se viva sibi . . . fecit*; 3489, *Numisia . . . se viva fecit*; 266, *Flavius se vivo monumentum fecit*; 3960, *Rufus coniunx se vivis compararunt*; Eph. Ep. 8. 30, *Me vivo f. c.*; 507, *Ipsa sibi se viva . . . f. c.* The climax of incorrectness is seen in a type like the following. 3509, *Valeria . . . se vivo fecit*; 5721, *(T)uravo . . . filio vivi fecit*.

#### INTERCHANGE OF CASES.

One of the most striking features of the language of inscriptions, as indeed of late Latin in general, is the extent to which confusion in cases appears and the ease with which one case is substituted for another. Bonnet<sup>2</sup> and Pirson<sup>3</sup> have not only discussed this point as it appears in the respective spheres with which they are dealing, but have also assigned sufficiently plausible reasons for it, the most potent of which are similarity in sound of the various endings in rapid pronunciation and the fall of *m* and *s* of the Accusative endings. In many cases, however, minor reasons may be offered sufficient to account for the substitution.<sup>4</sup>

*Nominative and Genitive*:—The peculiarities here may be traced to habits of thought under the influence of which the attention of the author was diverted from the strict syntactical connection of words. For example, the names of persons, even though in apposition with a word in some other case, were likely to be felt as titles and written in the Nominative. 6328<sup>b</sup>, *Manus Aureli Pacatiani filius possessor*; I. H. C. 166, *Hic sunt*

<sup>1</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 185; Carnoy, l. c., p. 268.

<sup>2</sup> l. c., p. 522.

<sup>3</sup> l. c., p. 187.

<sup>4</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 267.

sepulcra sanctorum . . . Nigrinus episc. Sefronius episc.; I. H. C. 228, Hic req(ui)escit corp(us) f(a)m(u)lorum dei Agoblasto (?) Abeataresus. Other examples, on the contrary, seem to offer peculiarities for which no explanation and certainly no justification is at hand. I. H. C. 259, In nomine dni . . . sive omnium eius sanctorum (?) . . . Mariae virginis bisseisique apostolis; I. H. C. 519, Requiescit . . . Eulalia mar(ty)ris. The influence of a contiguous word is seen in the following: 5304, Luni Tapili f. . . statuit; I. H. C. 276, Hic nos ea f(a)m(ul)a dei Eldonciae fundatum est.

*Nominative and Accusative*:—By far the most interesting examples of this type are those in which the Accusative takes the place of a Predicate Nominative or even of the subject. The examples are very late but are interesting as showing the inclination for the Accusative as well as the extent to which the cases were leveled. I. H. C. 494, Sit illi div(us) adiutorem et protectorem; I. H. C. 135, Perfectum est templum hunc; I. H. C. 396, Datum est . . . soledos III; I. H. C. 474, Aulam . . . fuit luteam. In the example 6180, Limenius, Euplium, Patinicus, Calimorfus, Torax, etc. (cf. Hübner's note on the inscription), *Euplium* may be the pet name of a horse and so put in the neuter. Here may be put the use of the Accusative for the Nominative in the construction "Attractio Inversa"; the examples seem worthy of recording.<sup>1</sup> 4125, Sententiam quam tulit L. Novius Rufus; I. H. C. 474, Hanc quam cernis aulam . . . fuit luteam.

*Genitive and Vocative*:—The Genitive is written for the Vocative in one inscription by a misunderstanding of its form. The sentence was begun in the form of direct address, which was kept up until the word *corpus* was reached, where under the influence of numerous inscriptions of a different type, the direct form of the proposition was dropped and the Genitive *abbatis* instead of the Vocative *abbas*, was attached as a limiting word

<sup>1</sup> Schmalz, l. c., p. 216, par. 12; G.-L., l. c., par. 617. 2.

to *corpus*. I. H. C. 142, Haec tenet (u)rna tu(u)m . . . corpus Vincenti abb(at)is.

*Genitive and Ablative*:—Rather remarkable is the substitution in a single inscription of the Genitive for the Ablative, which is more remarkable since it occurs in a well-understood formula. 1459, Statuas duas . . . unam nominis sui alteram patris poni iussit. The most plausible explanation here is that the writer instead of following the usual phraseology *suo* . . . *et nomine patris* has regarded the expression *nominis sui* as a sort of substitution for a proper noun, and is dealing with it just as with the phrase *statuam Minervae*. In the following epitaph the Genitive, though properly a limiting Genitive, may be said to be a weak substitute for the classical Ablative of Origin: I. H. C. 2, Sinticio . . . traens linea(m) Getarum (= ducens originem ab Getis. Hübner's note).

*Accusative and Ablative*:—The Accusative and Ablative are easily confused with one another owing to loss of final *m* of the former. This confusion occurs most readily after prepositions, as Carnoy's list<sup>1</sup> shows. The employing of the Accusative for the Ablative is especially noteworthy in an inscription where it clearly takes the place of the Ablative of Origin or Quality. I. H. C. 372, Aurelius . . . nationem Afram qui vixit, etc.

As an appendage here may be put numerous examples of a type that does not prove disintegration, nor throw light on syntax, but that involves irregularities which arise simply from confusion in the mind of the graver as to the form of the inscription with which he was dealing; so that the proper noun at the head of the inscription may be in one case and a word in apposition further down in quite another. With these may be compared Pirson's long list and discussion of same.<sup>2</sup> 1099, Maria Q. f. Nymphe M. Aureli uxori; 1262, M. Acenna . . . quaestori . . . IIIviro; 2054, Imp. Caesari divi Nervae f. divo Traiano optimo . . . pater patriae; 2126, C. Cornelius C. f. . . . flamen IIvir municipi pontifici, etc.; 2478, Imp. Caes.

<sup>1</sup> l. c., p. 205 and p. 269.

<sup>2</sup> l. c., p. 166.

Nerva Traiano Aug. Ger. Dacico; 4834, Imp. Caes. C. Iulius . . . et C. Iulius Verus . . . principi iuventutis; 4858, Imp. Caes(ar) C. Iulius Vero Maximinus; 5293, Caecilia Q. f. Tuscae; 382, D. M. P. Lucani . . . Romae sepulto.

### PRONOUNS.

The accurate distinctions of classical Latin were not adapted to the use of the people and many of them fall into disuse. It would be safe to assume that the difference between *suus* and *eius* or *eorum* would not be well preserved in popular speech and Pirson<sup>1</sup> has shown by means of a long list of examples that the boundary between these two in Gallic inscriptions is very narrow. His results apply equally well to Spanish inscriptions. They show the crude way of thinking of some of these writers, their careless method of forming sentences and their inability to carry out an idea to its conclusion. These deficiencies are well indicated, too, by the use of pronouns in the two inscriptions following, in each of which the author misunderstood the form of the inscription; in the one changing from first person to third and in the second, from second person to third: 4323, Aufidia Prima . . . sita sum posuit Florentinus eius (for *meus*); I. H. C. 242, Is rex Alfonsi patris sui vestigio prudenter . . . regnum gubernas (*sui* for *tui* and *is* for *tu*, or else *gubernas* for *gubernat*).

The curious appearance of what seems to be a syncopated form of the demonstrative *ille* is worthy of note. The brief document in which it is found is without date, but the reading seems well attested and the example genuine. 3668, La tumba Probae Publ. ingenuus (?) t. s. l. There is good reason to believe that the initial syllable of *ille* was very lightly uttered when in unemphatic position and appeared as probably (*il*)*lum patrem*, (*il*)*lam matrem*, etc., in pronunciation, so that eventually the definite article developed out of these contracted forms.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I. c., p. 203.

<sup>2</sup> Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 167. 4.



*La*, then, in the example given above may be taken as the graver's effort to represent *illa* as he heard it pronounced about him, and may show that even at this period this syncopated form was in vogue.<sup>1</sup> Noteworthy is the for Latin redundant use of the demonstrative pronoun as seen in a limited number of cases. Many examples of this Graecism, if it may be here so called, are given by Rönisch.<sup>2</sup> Eph. Ep. 9. 176, Ut puellam mitteres illam (cf. note on the inscription); I. H. C. 533, Q(u)em . . . sepelivit eam. Another Graecism that occurs in late and especially ecclesiastical Latin in which the relative pronoun is regarded as a sort of definite article is apparently found in one epitaph, unless one prefers to regard *uxori* as in apposition.<sup>3</sup> 5058, Cui benemeritae uxori . . . Chrysanthus dignum honorem dedit.

<sup>1</sup> Meyer-Lübke, l. c., 2, p. 135. 99 ff.; Rydberg, Geschichte des französischen ə, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> Itala und Vulgata, p. 444. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Rönisch, l. c., p. 444. 3.

## VERBS.

## TENSES.

The use of the Present for the Future and vice versa is common to the language at all periods and for that matter to all languages. Pirson<sup>1</sup> has outlined the extent of this usage in the inscriptions of Gaul, and the statement there made will apply also to Spanish inscriptions. The construction is essentially vivid and colloquial. At any rate the two tenses seem to be interchangeable at times and occasionally stand side by side in the same sentence and construction, as indeed, elsewhere in late Latin, so that it is impossible to tell which tense was meant by the author to prevail. Uncertainty is further caused by the easy substitution of *ẽ* for *ĩ* and vice versa.<sup>2</sup> 2262, Tu qui stas et leges titulum meum; 5058, Dicite qui legetis, cf. I. H. C. 232, Dicite qui legi(ti)s; 5241, Dic rogo qui transis; 1235, Quisquis legis . . . sentis quam vixerim; I. H. C. 125, Dum coelum et paradisum accipit homo; I. H. C. 142, Omnibus his mox est de flammis flammās tollere.

When one action in the future occurs before another also in the future, classical Latin required the antecedent action to be written in the Future Perfect. The attempt is noticeable in these inscriptions to observe this principle, but not infrequently confusion is apparent and the Future Perfect is extended to actions that are purely contemporaneous with the time of the principal verb. It seems that the boundaries of the use of the Future Perfect were made narrower, until after the best period its substitution for the Future was confined almost entirely to vulgar Latin, where apparently there was some inclination for it.

<sup>1</sup> I. c., p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet, I. c., p. 634; Schmalz, I. c., p. 334 (top).

Its use for the Future in conversational idiom is familiar.<sup>1</sup> Such may be its use in the following examples, at any rate within certain limits the two tenses appear to be interchangeable. 1276, Quoad vixero . . . dividam; 1276, Quot praestabo dumtaxat quoad vixero; I. H. C. 336, Siquis . . . inquietare voluerit sit anathema. This halting between Future and Future Perfect is further apparent in the formula *dic qui praeteris*, etc. 1634, Dicite qui legitis s. t. t. l.; 1126, Hic qui leg(i)s di(cas); 4174, Bene sit viator qui me non praeteristi; 1728, Te rogo praeteriens cum legis ut dicas. But: I. H. C. 283, Obsecramus qui haec legeritis; I. H. C. 496, Depreco vos . . . qui ad hunc sepulcrum intraveritis; I. H. C. 516, Qui legerit . . . oret. In a single inscription the inclusive formula in which the Present and Future Perfect are used parallel with one another is employed in imitation, perhaps, of well-known legal phraseology and is due to a false striving after exactness. 172, Quos . . . Caesari inimicos . . . esse cognovero . . . et siquis periculum infert intuleritve si(quis) sciens fallo fefellerove, tum, etc.

The Perfect Infinitive as an object of a verb is uncommon here as in the literature. Its use in a few cases is in conformity with the construction found in the poets.<sup>2</sup> 1414, Debueras . . . habuisse mille (annos); 4314, Quibus nequeas opposuisse manus.

### Moods.

*Infinitive*:—Inasmuch as inscriptions contain very little narrative and practically no lively nor spirited discourse, the Historical Infinitive rarely finds its way into them. One example only of its use may be found in Spanish inscriptions and here it is well adjusted to its surroundings. 6278<sup>15</sup>, Statim sacerdotes . . . concursare gaudere inter se loqui. The Greek construction of employing the Infinitive as a complement of adjectives, so freely used by the poets and to some extent by later prose writers also, is occasionally met with here. However, the

<sup>1</sup> Schmalz, l. c., p. 336, par. 217; Plautus, Cap. 194 (Lindsay's note).

<sup>2</sup> G. L., l. c., p. 180 (b).

examples are drawn from poetry, so there is nothing incorrect about the usage, which is by no means a favorite in inscriptions of Spain.<sup>1</sup> 4314, *Nec tamen ignari flectere lora manu*; I. H. C. 361, *Est homines vivificare potens*. The same remarks apply to the passive Infinitive with *dignus* in the case of which the poet is acting within his rights in employing it in a metrical inscription.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 392, *Dignus apostolico primus honore coli*. Several authentic cases of the Infinitive to express purpose appear. It is essentially popular in sphere and is supposed to have been adopted from vulgar Latin by poets and late prose writers. All of the examples occurring in these inscriptions are found in metrical epitaphs.<sup>3</sup> 4427, *Manes si saperent miscram me abducerent coniugem vivere iam quo me lucem iam nolo videre*; I. H. C. 158, *Cum flamma vorax veniet comburere terras*.

*Indicative in Indirect Questions*:—The only peculiarity to be noted in connection with the Indicative Mood is its use in indirect questions. At bottom, it is only one of the many evidences of the popular character of inscriptions, since this, like the Indicative in deliberative questions, is a feature of colloquial and poetical, as it is of late Latin usage. With these facts in mind, it would virtually amount to a peculiarity were this use of the Indicative not found in Spanish inscriptions, even though it is not met with in classical prose.<sup>4</sup> 4426, *Aspice quam subito marcet quod floruit ante aspice quam subito quod stetit ante cadit*; 6130, *Quare mortuus sum nescio*; I. H. C. 219, *Quis quantusve fuit Samson . . . personat Esperio*; I. H. C. 255, *Omnis conventus conoscat q(u)orum . . . veneratur reliquias*.

*Subjunctive for Imperative*:—In certain legal documents

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 504 (d); Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 378. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 331, par. 421.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 367, par. 433; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 501, 6 (a); Rönisch, l. c., p. 447.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 474; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 989. 2 with references; Riemann, *Etudes sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live*, p. 301, n. 3 and p. 10, n. 1; cf. Prop. 3. 5. 26 ff.; Bonnet, l. c., p. 676 and refs.



found in these inscriptions notably 5181, 5439, 1963, 1964, the Second Imperative is almost exclusively used and this is in conformity with Latin usage in such documents. This very fact makes the one example of the Subjunctive found in an inscription like the following worthy of notice:<sup>1</sup> 5181<sup>49</sup>, *Profiteantur et salvant* (cf. note).

*Mood after Conjunctions*:—Little out of the ordinary is found, but we may discuss the following: Peculiar is the employment of *dum* with the Subjunctive in a manner exactly parallel with the use of *cum*, however, retaining its distinctive meaning of “while, as long as, etc.” This may be due to the fact that *dum* = while and *cum* = when are separated by very narrow limits, and to a consequent blending or obliteration of the limits of the two. The construction is also found in the Latin of Gregory of Tours.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 12, *Dum simul . . . cum viro carpere(m) vitam . . . me fortuna tulit*; I. H. C. 65, *Iamq(ue) novem lustris gaudens du(m) vita maneret*. In still another example *dum* has both the meaning and construction of *cum*.<sup>3</sup> I. H. C. 385, *Dumque supremus litui crepor concusserit orbem*. In *dextera . . . queat tunc sorte(m) adesse*. *Forsitan* appears probably only once in all Spanish inscriptions and their tendency to depart from classical models is shown in this instance by the use of the Indicative; unless one prefers to regard it as an adverb here rather than as a conjunction as sometimes in Livy.<sup>4</sup> 4314, *Favisti vivo forsitam ipse mihi*. In apparently the only case in which *quamquam* occurs, it is found in the Subjunctive. 6278<sup>27</sup>, *Quamquam . . . nonnulli arbitrentur*.

#### IMPERSONAL VERBS.

Such Impersonal Verbs as *pudet*, *piget*, were used personally in the literature, but almost wholly in early or late Latin. The examples that can be cited, though not numerous, seem to show

<sup>1</sup> G-L., l. c., par. 268. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet, l. c., p. 319; Schmalz, l. c., par. 306. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 909, Rem. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Riemann, l. c., p. 292.

this.<sup>1</sup> An example of each of the above verbs used personally can be given from Spanish inscriptions and it is possible that here, too, the influence of *misereor* is at work. I. H. C. 496, Depreco vos . . . pro me Adefonso orare non pigcatis; 4284, Si sordes, patior; sed pudet hospitium.

#### REGIMEN OF VERBS.

In the matter of construction, verbs as employed in Spanish inscriptions closely resemble the verb of Silver Latin. They represent a wide sphere of extension over classical usage, as judged from the government of those with which we meet. The following list presents peculiarity either by wholly departing from the classical norm or by adopting a regimen not often used in the best period. They may be grouped broadly under two heads:

1. Verbs that rarely or never take an Infinitive construction in good Latin are loosely so employed.

*Cavere*.—In the example to be cited *cavere* seems to be identical in meaning with *curare*. The occurrences of *cavere* with an Infinitive are not many at any period of the language; the examples given by Draeger<sup>2</sup> with few exceptions are all equivalents of the Imperative, so that this example appears to be rather out of the ordinary for prose. 1359, Qui . . . caverat sepulcrum sibi fieri.

*Concedere*.—The Infinitive construction with this verb is usual only when the passive is used. In the active it is rare even in the poets.<sup>3</sup> 89, Quai fate concesserunt vivere.

*Decernere*.—Here the Infinitive construction is evidently by analogy to *iubere*. cf. 964, Statuam poni iussit. Numerous examples of this kind might be given. Draeger<sup>4</sup> cites a single example similar to that given below and this is taken from an African inscription. Such an example as: 1130, Statuam

<sup>1</sup> Neue, l. c., 3, p. 653.

<sup>2</sup> l. c., 2, p. 334; G-L., l. c., par. 548. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 330.

<sup>4</sup> l. c., 2, p. 407.

ponendam decrevit gives the normal construction in these inscriptions after *decernere*. 5522, Statuam equestrem poni decrevit Quintia.

*Eligere*.—I. H. C. 12, Hoc loco erga meos elegi quiescere proles.

*Mereri*.—With an Infinitive first in Propertius.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 96, Mereamur ingredi paradisi i(a)nue.

*Permittere*.—The Infinitive here belongs to the sphere of Silver Latinity.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 501, Ut non permitas introire angelum, etc.

*Praecipere*.—In late Latin *praecipere* became equivalent to *iubere* and is often so employed by the Church Fathers.<sup>3</sup> 4853, (V)ias et pontes . . . restitui praec(e)perun(t).

*Sancire*.—The customary regimen of *sancire* when followed by a clause is ut + Subjunctive. Draeger<sup>4</sup> mentions the Infinitive construction, but is not definite. Cicero lexicons reveal no example similar to those appended. I. H. C. 253, Hanc aulam construere sancserunt; I. H. C. 259, Hanc aedificari sanxit munitionem.

## 2. Verbs of miscellaneous constructions.

*Credere*.—This verb in a late Christian inscription shows the effect of the late Latin extension of the *quod* construction, employing it instead of the Accusative + Infinitive.<sup>5</sup> I. H. C. 95, Credo quod redemptor meus vivet.

*Curare*.—In a single inscription *curare* is followed by the Past Participle instead of the Gerundive which is its ordinary construction. It is a usage peculiar to early Latin; only *missam facere* occurs in the classical period.<sup>6</sup> 453, Factum curavit

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 331; Pirson, l. c., p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 330; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 809.3.

<sup>3</sup> Schmalz, l. c., p. 291.

<sup>4</sup> l. c., 2, p. 249.

<sup>5</sup> Rönsch, l. c., p. 427; Mayen, De Particulis quod quia quoniam quomodo ut pro Acc. cum Infinitivo post Verba sentiendi et declarandi positis. Diss., Kiel, 1889; Plautus, As. 52 (Gray's note).

<sup>6</sup> G. L., l. c., par. 537.2; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 572 (d).

Progela, etc. In still another example it is found with the Infinitive, which again is limited in usage.<sup>1</sup> 4788, Restituere (c)ururunt.

*Dicere*.—Somewhat similar to the regimen of *credere* just discussed is that of *dicere* in an epitaph where it is followed by an *ut* clause. It is barely possible to regard it as introducing an Indirect Question.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 232, D(i)cete qui leg(it)is ut me peccat(o)rem memor habeas (?) sacra ex oratione.

*Iubere*.—This verb to all appearances presents the unique construction of the Infinitive combined with a Subjunctive clause in the same sentence. Somewhat similar instances are seen in the Latin of Gregory of Tours.<sup>3</sup> I. H. C. 494, Iuss(i)t renovari . . . et pro tali laborem sit illi . . . adiutorem.

*Nolle*.—The Acc. + Inf. with same subject is not usual with this verb.<sup>4</sup> 4427, Me lucem iam nolo videre.

It remains to call attention to the frequency with which *ut* is omitted after verbs of asking, beseeching, etc., so characteristic of Petronius and of conversational idiom in general.<sup>5</sup> 462, Te rogo oro obsecro uti vindices; 558, Oro ut . . . dicas. But: 540, 958, Te rogo . . . dicas; 1235, Hoc peto nunc dicas; 1580, Te lapis obtestor . . . residas; I. H. C. 242, Quaesumus . . . dei gratia parcat ei.

#### COMPOUND VERBS.

Here may be treated the use of the simple for the compound verb and vice versa. It has already been emphasized by those who have touched upon this subject that the use of the simple for the corresponding compound verb and vice versa is a feature of poetical diction and, with limitations, of certain prose writers

<sup>1</sup> G-L., l. c., par. 423, n. 2; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 491 (e); Pirson, l. c., p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Rönsch, l. c., pp. 445 and 427.

<sup>3</sup> Bonnet, l. c., pp. 667 and 668; Saffold, The Constructions with Iubeo. Johns Hopkins University Diss., 1902.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., 2, p. 402 (e); Schmalz, l. c., p. 290, par. 154.

<sup>5</sup> G-L., l. c., par. 546.2, Rem. 2.



of the Augustan Age and after. In both it may be due largely to striving after rhetorical effect. It is also a characteristic of the *sermo plebeius* and one would expect to find something of this interchange in inscriptions, which are fairly representative of this type.<sup>1</sup> If the subject be fraught with difficulties in dealing with it as it appears in the literature, it is none the less so in a field like epigraphy. However, some evidence of this phenomenon seems to appear in these inscriptions, and, though it is impossible to be altogether definite in view of the small amount of material available and the consequent impossibility to duplicate examples, yet a number of these cases may be worth noticing and as far as practicable strengthening with citations from other sources.

*Cludo for Includo.*<sup>2</sup>—4550, Cuius basis lapidea aere clusa; 1821, Herenia . . . inclusa hoc tumulo; I. H. C. 144, Inclusi tenerum praetioso marmore corpus.

*Efficio for Facio.*—I. H. C. 245, Pontifex effectus.

*Fero for Aufero or other compounds.*<sup>3</sup>—1413, Viginti . . . tecum nam fers . . . annos; I. H. C. 34<sup>a</sup>, Te matremque tempus enorme tulit; I. H. C. 12, Me fortuna tulit; I. H. C. 223, Ad eroas latus (e)st; cf. 1414, LXX tecum transfers non amplius annos; 6064, Cui Parca vitam abstulerit praemature.

*Fungor for Defungor.*—I. H. C. 217, Functus in hac aula quiescit. Examples of *defungor* in this sense are plentiful. The reverse with a different meaning for the verbs may occur: 4261, Defuncto honoribus. Here *functus* is practically always found, occasionally *perfunctus*. 4526, Omnibus honoribus in rep(ub.) sua perfuncto; 4205, 4201, Ob legationem qua . . . funct(us) est; 4203, 4207, Omnib(us) honorib(us) . . . functo.

*Infero for Aufero.*—I. H. C. 249<sup>b</sup>, Quisquis inferre . . . donaria nostra presumpserit; cf. I. H. C. 256, Quisquis auferre . . . donaria nostra sumpserit.

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, Transactions A. P. A. XXXI, 1900, p. 205 and refs.

<sup>2</sup> Tac., Ger. 45. Animalia . . . quae implicata humore mox durescente materia cluduntur (Furneaux' note).

<sup>3</sup> Riemann, l. c., p. 194.

*Loquor for Conloquor.*—6278<sup>15</sup>, Inter se loqui.

*Pleo for Impleo.*<sup>1</sup>—6278<sup>38</sup>, Tantisper plendi numeri gregiariorum gratia.

*Scando for Conscendo.*<sup>2</sup>—I. H. C. 255, Scendens Xrs in altum. This is frequent enough in good prose, but as a rule *conscendo* is used in these inscriptions.

*Teneo for Contineo or other compounds.*<sup>3</sup>—I. H. C. 142, Haec tenet (u)rna . . . corpus, etc. cf. I. H. C. 363, Retinet quos Corduba; I. II. C. 129, Ista vorax fossa Dominici continet ossa; I. H. C. 123, Haec cava saxa contine(n)t membra.

*Transeo for Praetereo.*<sup>4</sup>—3181, Qui transis lege. In the literature these two verbs appear to be interchangeable, but a casual glance at Spanish inscriptions will show that in this formula *praetereo* is practically always employed. The above example is the only one of *transeo*.

To these may be added certain others of frequent occurrence, where the use alternates between simple and compound and which may be said to be practically interchangeable everywhere. It is superfluous to name them at any length. Such are: *decoro* and *condecoro*; Eph. Ep. 8. 194, Monumento hoc condecoravit: *condo* and *recondo*; I. H. C. 85, Hic sunt reliquiae conditae; I. H. C. 88, Hic sunt reconditae: *iungo* and *coniungo*; I. H. C. 34<sup>a</sup>, Tumulo iungeris; I. H. C. 213, Atletis iungitur rite; I. H. C. 255, His pariter co(n)iunctae sunt; I. H. C. 218<sup>b</sup>, Coniunctus mansit: *curro* and *percurro*; 5975, Quisquis in has partes quisquis percurr(is): *moveo* and *promoveo*; 6278<sup>37</sup>, Lanistas etiam promovendos vili studio: *sacro* and *consecro*; 2243, C. Valerius . . . hic consecravit; I. H. C. 172 and 175, Ecclesiae sacratae sunt; I. H. C. 100.4, Consecrata e(st) baselica haec.

#### PREPOSITIONS.

*A or Ab.*—The only peculiarity here is one of form. In several inscriptions, *a* is used instead of *ab* before a word beginning

<sup>1</sup> Festus, p. 291, de Ponor.

<sup>2</sup> Riemann, l. c., p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> Riemann, l. c., p. 197.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Vergil, Aen. 5. 326 (Conington's note); Prop. 3. 7. 27.

with a vowel. Other examples do not appear to be at hand.<sup>1</sup> 4895, 4896, 4899, A Augustobriga.

*Cum*.—The analytical tendency of this period of Latin is shown by a late Christian inscription in which means is expressed by the aid of *cum*. This may be styled an ante-classical and post-classical usage. Many examples occur in the Latin of Gregory of Tours.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 238, Cum dei adminiclo Frankila abba condidit opus. The Ablative, usually with the preposition *cum*, is regularly employed as in classical Latin to express the appurtenances of a thing, in particular of grounds and buildings dedicated to the gods. To this, one possible exception is noted in Spanish inscriptions and here the simple Ablative is used. The text, however, is probably corrupt. 3960, Compararunt locum uti est concameratum parietib(us) balneis hortis monumentum construxerunt. cf. 1163, Sig(num) (aere)um . . . cum base d.d.; 1956, Porticus ad balineum solo suo cum piscina et signo Cupidinis . . . d.d.; 2326, Venerem Aug. cum parergo; 3240, Factis pontibus et fistulis . . . cum suis ornamentis.

*De*.—The Ablative with *de* is used to indicate the means by which something is erected and is especially common in the phrases *de suo*, *de meo*, etc.<sup>3</sup> It has been shown by Pirson<sup>4</sup> that in Gallic inscriptions means is seldom expressed by the simple Ablative as in *fecit impensa sua*. In Spanish inscriptions, however, the simple Ablative in such phrases is found almost, if not quite, as frequently as the prepositional form *de sua pecunia*. The preposition is exclusively used only in *de suo posuit*. 1277, 1341, 2035, 2041, Sua pecunia posuit; 1250, 1367, Impensa sua fecit; 1724, Impensa sua extruxit; 2070, Sumptu publico posuit; 3570, Sua pecunia restituerunt; 3240, 3280, 5181<sup>19</sup>, Sua omni impensa.

Many cases of *de* and the Ablative instead of the Partitive Genitive occur in examples where classical Latin furnishes a

<sup>1</sup> Neue, I. c., 2, pp. 827 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet, I. c., p. 603; Kühner, I. c., 2, par. 93.3 (c) γ; Schmalz, I. c., p. 272, par. 128.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, I. c., 1, p. 628.

<sup>4</sup> I. c., p. 197.

sufficient parallel. Eph. Ep. 8.128, Aemilio Balaeso . . . cognatio de cen(turia) ; 1585, M. Pompeius . . . primus de familia Pompeia ; Eph. Ep. 8.30, Si qui de meis. Also in places where no pronoun or word upon which the expression depends is written: 5439<sup>3.4.29</sup>, Si quis accusator de suo tempore alteri concesserit. But the frequency of this partitive use of *de*, as well as its tendency to supplant the Genitive, is best illustrated in late Christian inscriptions, where the best defined examples may be seen.<sup>1</sup> These examples mark an advance over the same or similar construction found in classical Latin in that here the *de* phrase and the Genitive are not only parallel, but practically equivalent, as shown by their use in the same sentence. I. H. C. 175<sup>b</sup>, Recondite sunt ic reli(quiae) cruore . . . pane . . . cruce . . . de sepulcro . . . crucis ; I. H. C. 255, Intra praeciosissima praesentis arce latera hoc est de ligno plurimum sive de cruce d(omi)ni ; de vestimento illius . . . de pane . . . de sepul(c)ro . . . atque sudario et cruore . . . de vestimentis . . . de lacte ; quaedam . . . et reliquiae . . . ho(c est) . . . de S(an)c(t)o Tome, s(an)c(t)i Bartolom(ei), (d)e omnibus ap(osto)lis et de aliis quam plurimis s(an)c(t)is ; I. H. C. 263, Hic sunt reliquie S. Mariae de lacte eius, de S. Paulo, de S. Vincent., etc. ; I. H. C. 471, Hic sunt reliquiae reconditae, id s(un)t d(e) cruore dñi de ligno dñi de sepulcro . . . See Marie, s(an)c(t)or(um) Petri et Pauli ; I. H. C. 260 (see p. 120 addenda), Reliquiae que ibi sunt: de ligno dñi, . . . de pane dñi, de sepulcro dñi. By the side of these we may put certain cases of the real Partitive construction as it exists in Old Spanish, where it occurs with no great degree of frequency.<sup>2</sup> Poema del Cid 481, Tanto traen las grandes ganancias, muchos gañados de averes e de vacas e de ropas e de otras riquezas ; Poema del Cid 673, No nos darán del pan ; Libro de Alexandre 770<sup>a</sup>, Priso luego la manga e saco de los granos ; Libro de Apolonio 289<sup>c</sup>, Priso del puro bálsamo. This analytical ten-

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal, ed. H. L. Wilson, Introd., p. xlvii (d) and references ; Reisig, Lateinische Sprachwissenschaft, 3, p. 694 (note).

<sup>2</sup> Meyer-Lübke, l. c., 3, p. 404, par. 366.



dency is pronounced in a few examples where *de* + Ablative takes the place of the simplest form of the Latin Genitive.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 472, Episcopus de Sanctae Mariae feci; I. H. C. 284, Rogare pro anima de d(omini)co Belazani; I. H. C. 34, Ego Simeon filius de Rebbi, etc.

*Ex*.—Apparently *ex* gives a loose way of expressing means in an inscription too corrupt to deal with accurately (cf. note on the line). I. H. C. 276, Mee arcitecton fuit facta ex mea munera emta hec domus. In Cicero the verb *recreate* regularly takes the preposition *ex* with the noun indicating that from which one is recovering, while the simple Ablative marks the means. From Spanish inscriptions we may cite the following: 2036, Ancipiti morbo recreatus.

*In*.—With the signification of “in accordance with,” “with respect to,” the preposition *in* goes back to the early period of the language, but is limited to a given number of formulae. Cicero has the expressions *in formulam*, *in sententiam*; Plautus, *in leges*, *in formam*, *in faciem*, *in speciem*, etc. Naturally one finds the list of such examples lengthened in later writers. The expression *in verba* seems not to appear prior to Livy and Quintilian. It is in conformity with the usage of this school that we find it in these inscriptions.<sup>2</sup> 5406, Neve ut in ea verba quae in verba . . . dari solet repromitteret.

With verbs of motion at this period there was a wavering between the simple Accusative and an Accusative construction with the appropriate preposition. (See the construction with *ingredior*, p. 25). It is doubtless due to this uncertainty that the preposition *in* is written after one of these verbs, where in good Latin a simple Accusative of the Direct Object is usual and sufficient.<sup>3</sup> 4514, Consecutus in honores aedilicios.

Followed by the Ablative *in* is used in a few examples apparently expressing means.<sup>4</sup> I. H. C. 143, Posside constructam

<sup>1</sup> Bonnet, l. c., p. 611; Pirson, l. c., p. 196 and ref.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 656.

<sup>3</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 267.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 652.12; Schmalz, l. c., p. 275; Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 408.3.

in aeterno munere sedem; I. H. C. 363, Factis celebrantur in istis. In others it occurs in a way almost parallel with *cum*, perhaps traceable to the influence of the Vulgate.<sup>1</sup> I. II. C. 33, Requievit in pace; I. H. C. 335, Sepelivit eam hac tumulto ecclesiae in pace; cf. I. H. C. 186, Vixit . . . cum pace; I. H. C. 34, Ingredere cum pace. It is further seen in a certain number of metaphorical relations for which parallels may be found in the literature.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 413<sup>b</sup>, Praefluus in lacrimis; I. H. C. 277, Momus in corpore vivens fecit; 4967.40 (a), Vivas in Christo, (b) Spes in deo.

In the examples just considered the preposition is analogous to the English idiom in similar cases. In one or two more it is not only parallel with English, but at the same time further removed from standard Latin usage. I. H. C. 215, Annos in tempore quattuor; I. H. C. 396, Datum est . . . in auro soledos III. cf. Spanish PAGAR IN AURO.<sup>3</sup>

It is customary in Spanish inscriptions, as in others also, and in classical Latin for the word *nomen* to be used in the simple Ablative to express in whose name a given action is performed or anything is donated. In a few late inscriptions *in* is found inserted with *nomen* and may possibly be explained by the growing tendency to resort to the analytical construction, as in the case of *de* already noticed, and so to simplify the complexity of classical Latin. I. H. C. 259, 265, 267, 269. In nomine domini dei, etc. Deserving mention only for its strangeness is an example of *in* like the following, where Hübner attempts to explain its presence by confusion on the part of the author with *intemperies*: 4853, (Via)s et pont(e)s in temporibus vetustate conlap(s)os.

*Iuxta*.—The use of *iuxta* with the meaning of "according to" is distinctly late.<sup>4</sup> 191, Thermae . . . renovatae a solo iuxta iussionem Numeri, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Pirson, l. c., p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 652. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Meyer-Lübke, l. c., 3, p. 526.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 587. 3 (b); Hand, Tursellinus, 3, p. 542. 7; Pirson, l. c., p. 273.

*Per.*—The ordinary prose construction used in referring to the building or location of a bridge upon a river was *in* + Ablative. In the example below, *per* is employed and the explanation probably is because *via* is metaphorically used for *pons*, so that *per* applies to the former, *in* to the latter.<sup>1</sup> I. H. C. 23<sup>a</sup>, *Perdiderat usum suspensa via per amnem.*

*Pro.*—*Pro* is employed only in late inscriptions with the object for which something is given in exchange and is so construed in the literature also.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 494, *Aveat pro tali facto . . . remuneracionem*; I. H. C. 396, *Datum est pro locello . . . soledos III.* In classical Latin, *pro* was attached to certain verbs, such as *petere*, *supplicare*, etc., with the appropriate idea of “in behalf of.” In later writers it was extended to other verbs, such as *timere*, *sollicitari*, etc.<sup>3</sup> It is by analogy with these and especially with *orare* that in these inscriptions *pro* is found with *rogare*, which at this period had taken on the meaning of “pray” in an intransitive sense. I. H. C. 284, *Rogare pro anima*, etc.

*Secundum.*—This preposition deserves mention only on account of the unusual phrase of which it forms a part. Here it means “along,” as in Latin of all periods.<sup>4</sup> But it appears in the phrase *secundum parietem* as a substitute for *in fronte*, a turn probably occurring nowhere else (cf. editor’s note). Eph. Ep. 9.78, *Primigenia . . . h. s. e. s. t. t. l.; secundo pariete p. VII.* In a. p. X.

*Sub.*—*Sub* is regularly employed in set phrases to denote time.<sup>5</sup> I. H. C. 328, *Sub mence Novembres*; I. H. C. 338, 379, 304, *Recessit in pace sub die idus*, etc. It is further employed in a variety of phrases where it was but sparingly used by classical writers, but more frequently by later authors. 518, *Sub cura*; 1423, *Sub nomine meo*; I. H. C. 472, *Sub Chr(ist)i n̄mē*; I. H. C. 244, *Sub Christi . . . gratia . . . fecit*; I. H. C. 361,

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 647 (d); Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 408 (top).

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 643. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 643. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 600 (b).

<sup>5</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, pp. 661-662; Schmalz, l. c., p. 276, par. 137.

Sub terrore . . . metuentes ite; I.H.C. 470, Sub virtus Christi; I. H. C. 470, Sub misericordia et gratia domini. Separate citation is merited by the phrase: 4514, Sub eadem forma. It is apparently an obvious parallel to the phrases *sub formula*, *sub lege* of classical authors.<sup>1</sup> In certain other connections this preposition is superfluous, since its omission would constitute an Ablative Absolute construction. However, similar examples are found in Livy.<sup>2</sup> I. H. C. 519, Sub Daciano pre-side; I. H. C. 469, Sub valente . . . Adefonso principe.

*Super*.—Occasionally *super* is used to denote excess. I. H. C. 470, Era LXXVIII super millesima. But especially is it allied with later usage in the phrase *super omnes*.<sup>3</sup> 4105, Su(per) omnes retro princi(pes) providentissimo; 4112, Su(per) omnes reliqu(os) praesedes iustissimo; I. H. C. 362, Super omnia castos.

#### ADVERBS.

From Demonstrative and Relative Pronouns are formed a set of adverbs indicating place and direction which, in standard prose, are marked by the frequency as well as by the carefulness and accuracy of their use. The 'whither,' 'where' and 'whence' adverbs were restricted each to its proper sphere and no infringement of one upon the territory of the other was allowed. Just as in English 'there' and 'where' are used indifferently of situation and motion to a place, so it is probable that in colloquial Latin this same confusion was usual and accepted.<sup>4</sup> The loss of distinction may also be inferred from the Romance derivatives.<sup>5</sup> In Spanish inscriptions and especially in the later ones it is just this imperfect distinction between these classes of adverbs that is noticeable; so that the boundary between *hinc* and *hic*, *ibi* and *eo* becomes extremely

<sup>1</sup> Drager, l. c., 1, p. 661 (e) and (f); Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 302, Rem. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 661 (e); Kühner, l. c., 2, p. 415. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 663. 3; Schmalz, l. c., p. 276. 138.

<sup>4</sup> Ap., Met. 9. 39: Ubi ducis asinum istum; Hand, l. c., 3, p. 165. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Meyer-Lübke, l. c., 3, pp. 531 ff.; cf. p. 486.



faint, if not quite obliterated. Just as in the case of *hoc* and *hunc*, similarity of sound in the pronunciation of *hic*, *huc* and *hinc* would be sufficient to account for their loss of identity, and analogy to these might have influence in the case of *ibi*, *ubi* and *eo*. 2592<sup>b</sup>, Hinc sepulta est; 4386, Lolia Porei f. hinc (s)ita; 4402, Rubena . . . hinc sitast; I. H. C. 86, Hic sursum rapta; I. H. C. 110, Hu(c con)ditae sunt; I. H. C. 474, Adduxerunt ibi de urbe Avila.

In Silver Latin, as well as in the language of a later period, appears quite a considerable class of adverbs formed from the prepositions *ex* and *de* combined with an adjective. Such are: *ex adverso*, *ex diverso*<sup>1</sup> and the Ovidian *e duro*, *e facili*, *ex aequo*.<sup>2</sup> Here would seem to be indicated growth in the formation of such adverbial phrases. To these, it appears, may be added the rare *e recenti*, which, though analogous to those just mentioned, is apparently found only in the passage given below: 5181<sup>26</sup> (Aena quibus utetur) lavare tergere unguereque adipe e recenti. Not only was the list being extended in this direction, but new and stronger adverbs were being formed by combining a preposition with a simple adverb, a common expedient in classical Latin, where it was limited to a few forms like *exinde*, *exadversum*, *subinde*, *de super* and the like found at all periods of the language. In Silver Latinity there is a noticeable increase in these compounds. We may cite *circumundique* from Statius and Gellius, *circumsecus* from Apuleius, and others.<sup>3</sup> We may further add *ex tunc*,<sup>4</sup> *ex invicem*,<sup>5</sup> *abistinc*,<sup>6</sup> *exsuper*.<sup>7</sup> It is evident, then, that *exundique* is due to the increasing inclination for such compounds in late Latin and that the preposition is merely added for emphasis, because the simple adverb was felt to have lost directive force. I. H. C. 469, Hoc templum decorum . . . exundique amplificatum erigitur.

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 633 (c).

<sup>2</sup> Madvig, Adv. Crit. 2, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Draeger, l. c., 1, p. 126.

<sup>4</sup> Rönisch, l. c., p. 233.

<sup>5</sup> Souter, Archiv 10. 412.

<sup>6</sup> Johnston, The Querolus, p. 58. Johns Hopkins University Diss., Toronto, 1900.

<sup>7</sup> Carnoy, l. c., p. 266.

The adverb *usque* in classical Latin was employed in a variety of connections, chiefly, however, in strengthening prepositions and adverbs of time or their equivalents. This process of attaching it to various adverbs widened until in post-classical times it might be used with practically any adverb or preposition. So we find in Spanish inscriptions, I. H. C. 259, *Usque nunc*, said by Draeger<sup>1</sup> to be a Vitruvian phrase.

---

The deviations from normal usage in Spanish inscriptions are less frequent than in the inscriptions of Gaul. No such long lists of peculiar constructions, of new and unfamiliar words reward the seeker here as in Gallic inscriptions, nor is the extension in every field quite so wide in the former as in the latter. This is due in part to the fact that in Gallic inscriptions the body of material is larger, in part it may be due to the thoroughness with which Spain as a province was Romanized. Nevertheless, the evidence of their popular character is patent and complete, and harmonizes thoroughly with the facts hitherto ascertained in regard to Folk Latin. Further it is largely on the basis of the Christian inscriptions that such a conclusion may be reached; often one must turn to these to find examples of that which varies widely from classical usage. If it be possible to classify these inscriptions even in the most general way, it may be said that in syntax, vocabulary and style they seem to be allied with Silver Latin. Deviations from the usage of Cicero are numerous, but they usually take us into the domain of Silver Latinity. Not often does a usage occur in the better class of documents that cannot be duplicated in that sphere or actually traced back to it. Further than this, the influence of the Augustan poets is unmistakable, chiefly in the metrical epitaphs, where we find manifest imitations of them, not only in the extension characteristic of this group of writers, but also in sentence structure and word formation.

<sup>1</sup>l. c., I, p. 126; cf. Bonnet, l. c., p. 593.

In the Christian inscriptions again, the influence of the Vulgate must, of course, be taken into account; its restraining effect is no doubt to be seen in the fixity of expression and literalness that to some extent prevail. Often the thought seems a mere copy instead of a flexible product of the writer's own mind. This is sometimes sufficient to account for a strange use of the Infinitive, a rare instance of the Subjunctive, or some other construction at variance with the normal Latin idiom.

To one seeking or expecting abundant traces of the beginnings of Spanish as distinct from the other Romance tongues, these inscriptions are disappointing, for while they throw light upon the development of the Romance languages in general, to the development of Spanish in particular they have contributed practically nothing outside of vocabulary.





## VITA.

---

Henry Martin was born near Fredericksburg, Va., Nov. 26, 1878. His preliminary education was acquired in the schools of Caroline County. His collegiate course was pursued at Richmond College, Va., where he graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1899, and Master of Arts in 1901. During four years he taught in secondary schools in the State. In 1903 he entered the Johns Hopkins University for graduate work, selecting as his subjects Latin, Spanish and French. He also completed the course in undergraduate Greek at the University and attended for a year graduate lectures under Professors Gildersleeve and Robinson. He was appointed Fellow in Latin in 1905, and in 1906 was Latin Instructor at Notre Dame College of Maryland. Acknowledgments are due to the Professors in the Romance Department of the University, to Prof. H. L. Wilson, at whose suggestion this subject was undertaken, and to Prof. K. F. Smith, whose many acts of kindness are gratefully remembered.









